



United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.		
09/970,702	10/05/2001	Hajime Takei	018656-252	1791		
75	90 04/19/2006		EXAM	INER		
Platon N. Mandros			MURPHY,	MURPHY, DILLON J		
BURNS, DOAN	NE, SWECKER & MATI	HIS, L.L.P.				
P.O. Box 1404			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER		
Alexandria, VA	22313-1404		2625	2625		
			DATE MAIL ED. 04/10/2004	DATE MAILED: 04/10/2004		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
Advisory Action	09/970,702	TAKEI ET AL.				
Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Dillon J. Murphy	2625				
The MAIL ING DATE of this communication anne		correspondence add	ress			
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address THE REPLY FILED 10 April 2006 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.						
1. ☑ The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of						
this application, applicant must timely file one of the follow places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a No a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance	wing replies: (1) an amendment, aff otice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in c	fidavit, or other evider compliance with 37 C	nce, which FR 41.31; or (3)			
 time periods: The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing date of the final rejection. 						
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire I	Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing	g date of the final rejecti	on.			
Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 7 Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1,136(a). The date	06.07(f).					
have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of exunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office late may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b)	tension and the corresponding amount shortened statutory period for reply orig r than three months after the mailing da	of the fee. The appropr inally set in the final Offi	iate extension fee ce action; or (2) as			
NOTICE OF APPEAL 2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).						
AMENDMENTS	Willing the time period set forth in c	57 Of IV 41.07(u).				
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will <u>not</u> be entered because						
(a) They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);						
 (b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below); (c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for 						
(c) I hey are not deemed to place the application in be appeal; and/or	tter form for appear by materially re	ducing or simplifying	the issues for			
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).		jected claims.				
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.1		ompliant Amendment	(PTOL-324).			
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s						
 Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be a non-allowable claim(s). 						
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is pro The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:	will not be entered, or b) will will will be used to be	ill be entered and an o	explanation of			
Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to:			-			
Claim(s) rejected: Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:						
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE						
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, be because applicant failed to provide a showing of good ar was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 	ut before or on the date of filing a N nd sufficient reasons why the affidat	lotice of Appeal will <u>ne</u> vit or other evidence i	ot be entered s necessary and			
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessar	overcome all rejections under appe	eal and/or appellant fa	ils to provide a			
10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.						
REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER						
11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:						
12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper No(s)						
Kyl-1-						
MING Y. POON PRIMARY EXAMINER						

Continuation of 13. Other: Applicant argues, on pages 1-2 of Remarks, filed April 10, 2006, that Hansen does not teach a "sorting means for... separating the finishing specifics included in the job ticket received by the receiving means into those to be performed by the printer and those to be performed by the finishing device."

The examiner respectfully disagrees, citing the Cambridge Dictionary Online for the definition of sorting: "to put a number of things in order or to separated them into groups" and separating: "to divide into parts". The printing system of Hansen teaches sorting for separating finishing specifics in Hansen, col 7, In 30-42, and especially In 32-36, wherein print jobs are spooled and queued based on attributes of print jobs (i.e. a job ticket) and how those attributes are satisfied by the print engine (i.e. based upon the specification and installed options of the printer and of the finishing device). Various means are provided in order to separate finishing specifics into those to be performed by the printer and those to be performed by the finishing device. As previously mentioned, printing specifics and finishing specifics are inherently separated by virtue of being queued to different devices. Based upon the attributes of the printer, the printer specifics are performed while passing the remaining part of the job ticket is preformed by the finishing device. As seen in Hansen, col 7, In 15-20, some devices do not support electronice transfer and therefore the finishing specifics must be separated between those that may be performed by the printing device to produce a partially finished document, and those to be performed by the finishing device to provide a special binding process. Additionally, in col 7, In 36-38, it is possible to split color from black and white jobs, thereby separating the finishing specifics for those respective sub jobs.

Applicants remarks are not persuasive, and the claimed limitations of the finally rejected claims are still met by the prior art of record...